

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AMARILLO DIVISION

BOBBY SAUCEDO,

Petitioner,

v.

2:24-CV-90-Z-BR

BRYAN COLLIER,

Respondent.

**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION
AND
DISMISSING PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS**

Before the Court are the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 4) to deny the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus filed by the petitioner in this case (ECF No. 3). No objections to the findings, conclusions, and recommendation have been filed. After making an independent review of the pleadings, files, and records in this case, the District Judge concludes that the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge are correct. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 4) are **ADOPTED**, and the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus is **DISMISSED**.¹

Considering the record in this case and pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22(b), Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts, and 28 U.S.C. Section 2253(c), the Court denies a certificate of appealability because Petitioner

¹ Petitioner Saucedo is cautioned that the 1996 amendments to the habeas corpus statute impose a one-year statute of limitations for filing habeas corpus petitions in federal court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d); *Caldwell v. Dretke*, 429 F.3d 521, 528–29 (5th Cir. 2005). This provision applies to this petition as well as any other petition that he may file in this Court.

has failed to make “a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *see also Hernandez v. Thaler*, 630 F.3d 420, 424 (5th Cir. 2011).

The Court **ADOPTS** and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge’s findings, conclusions, and recommendation filed in this case in support of its finding that Petitioner has failed to show (1) that reasonable jurists would find this Court’s “assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong,” or (2) that reasonable jurists would find “it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right” and “debatable whether [this Court] was correct in its procedural ruling.” *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484.

SO ORDERED.

June 13, 2024.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M. J. Kacsmark', is written over a horizontal line.

MATTHEW J. KACSMARYK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE